

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph as failing to provide an enabling disclosure for “the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow system.” This rejection is respectfully traversed and the Examiner’s attention is drawn to the specification at page 6, line 6-13 and page 8, line 6 through page 9, line 4, and in particular, page 8, line 30 to page 9, line 4.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combinations of Yamamoto (U.S. 6,385,640), Ivanov (U.S. 5,706,452) and Frantz (U.S. 6,003,070). These rejections are respectfully traversed especially in view of the forgoing amendments to independent Claims 1, 6, 7, 10 and 11.


It is respectfully submitted that alone or in combination, Yamamoto, Ivanov, and Frantz fail to teach “the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, the command is used to activate the work flow, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow system”.

Ivanov teaches only that the reviewers are notified that the document is ready for their review by a workflow manager (30). So Ivanov does not teach “the second computer apparatus”, “a work flow in the second work-flow system”, “the command is used to activate the work flow”, and “the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command”. Moreover the reviewer is human being and not a computer apparatus.

Frantz teaches only that the technician sends the e-mail used to repair or upgrade, and the information about the status of the equipment that would be used by a technician in repairing is sent via E-mail. So Frantz does not teach “the second computer apparatus”, “a work flow in the second work-flow system”, “the command is used to activate the work flow”, and “the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command”. Moreover the technician is human being and not a computer apparatus.

Thus, the prior art fails to teach or suggest several specifically claimed features of the present invention. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark P. Watson
Registration No. 31,448

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Customer No. 20178
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: November 8, 2005